F3N8BURC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 15 Cr. 73 (RMB) v. 5 EVGENY BURYAKOV, 6 Defendant. 7 ----x 8 March 23, 2015 11:05 a.m. 9 Before: 10 HON. RICHARD BERMAN 11 District Judge 12 APPEARANCES 13 PREET BHARARA 14 United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 15 ADAM FEE ANNA SKOTKO 16 Assistant United States Attorneys 17 LATHAM & WATKINS Attorneys for Defendant 18 BENJAMIN NAFTALIS IRINA SIVACHENKO 19 20 Also present: YANA AGOUREEV, Russian interpreter 21 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

THE COURT: So the last time we were together for a conference we had, and we have today, a Russian language interpreter, but on standby I guess.

So, Mr. Buryakov, my understanding is that you understand everything we are saying. But if you don't and you want to turn to the interpreter, you're welcome to do that.

OK?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: So a couple of items that I have, just really principally one and some scheduling issues.

Back on March 13 I received a fax in chambers from the government. There was no information on the fax transmittal about what they were transmitting, but enclosed with the fax was a document called protective order pertaining to unclassified information, and it had the signature of one of the defense counsel on it. I guess I am being asked -- I understand that I would in the normal course -- to so order this protective order. But I thought it was worthwhile to have you here in court today so we could place on the record, first from the government, in summary detail what this is about and what you're looking for, and then I will turn to the defense, and just to make sure, Mr. Naftalis, that you have discussed this in detail with Mr. Buryakov and he is OK with it.

This order does not consider what we call classified

information, it is specifically directed at unclassified information, but let me hear from the government as to what it is and what you would like me to do with it.

MR. FEE: Thank you, your Honor.

As your Honor mentioned, this is a proposed protective order relating to unclassified discovery in this case. We had mentioned at the initial appearance before your Honor that this would be coming.

To give it some context, the protective order is relatively limited. Under the terms of this order, the defendant would receive all of the discovery in electronic form for review at prison; he is at the MCC right across the street. And, of course, defense counsel will receive all the discovery in electronic form. And for those things that can be produced in hard copy, they are free under this order to print them out in hard copy.

What the protective order principally does, and I will briefly explain the cause, the reason why we are seeking this from the government's perspective after this, it principally limits it in two ways, the discovery. Number one, it restricts what the defense can do in terms of distributing discovery to anyone outside of the defense team, meaning counsel and others assisting them and obviously the defendant.

THE COURT: It also limits the defendant in that regard as well.

MR. FEE: It does, of course. And all of its protections or restrictions apply to counsel and the defendant or any other member of the defense team.

The second meaningful restriction is it takes a portion of the discovery and essentially provides that hard copies of that portion of the discovery cannot be provided in hard copy to the defendant within the prison. It makes a distinction between parts of the discovery in this case, meaning there are some things under this order he would not be permitted to have hard copies of; there are some things he could have hard copies of. We have agreed with the defense to give them notice, via discovery production letter, of what those things are.

I can say in the initial production of discovery in this case, there are really two things that this order would limit the defendant's ability to obtain hard copies of in the prison. It is search warrant affidavits in this case, as well as the transcripts of certain audio recordings relating to co-conspirators of the defendant. And to be clear, he will have all of that in electronic form, just not hard copy.

The good cause here, in general terms, is there are sensitive materials in this case -- conversations involving what the government believes are foreign intelligence agents operating in New York City in the search warrant affidavits and in other materials; there are discussions by an FBI agent about

some of the techniques used by the FBI to uncover the activities of these agents; and, of course, the content of the conversations themselves is sensitive in that it talks about what these foreign agents are doing here in the United States.

For that reason, your Honor, we are seeking a protective order. We are seeking those specific but limited restrictions on the hard copies simply because if hard copies of those materials are introduced into the prison facility, even if it were something other than the defendant himself wishing to sort of put them in the stream, they can be taken, they can be removed from his cell, they can be removed from the prison library by others, even by accident or the malfeasance of someone other than the defendant, and at that point they are in the stream of information and certainly beyond our control.

THE COURT: To be sure, and you said this before, he gets to see them whether they are electronic or hard copy; it's not as if you're trying to keep any of this information from Mr. Buryakov or his counsel.

MR. FEE: Correct, your Honor. He gets everything.

I should say most of the discovery, in relative terms nearly all of it, is in a form that couldn't even be reproduced in hard copy -- video surveillance, audio recordings; pictures which could be printed, but most of it is not in that category.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Naftalis, the fax that I referred to

before came to chambers and it was dated -- signed, first of all, by Marja Barton?

MR. NAFTALIS: I think it's actually my signature.

THE COURT: That's your signature, Benjamin Naftalis, and dated March 13, 2015. Is that right?

MR. NAFTALIS: Yes. I think the government transmitted it to you, but that is my signature and date.

THE COURT: It says that you agreed and consent to this protective order. I want to make sure that you conferred with Mr. Buryakov before you signed it and went over it with him so he understands what it says.

MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor. My colleague and I have met with Mr. Buryakov about the protective order. We have reviewed the limitations that would be placed on his review, or actually his access to certain hard copy materials, though they will be on the electronic hard drive, and we are comfortable with that.

One request I would make now -- I had raised with the government before -- is because most of the materials in this case are on a hard drive, I am foreseeing that there is going to be an issue with his being able to review it in a timely way given the limited number of hours at the library.

THE COURT: The limited number of hours that they can use computers?

MR. NAFTALIS: Exactly. And since he, unlike most

everyone else there,	can't	bring	stuff	back	to	his	cell,	we	
would ask that he be	given	additi	onal	time	at t	the I	library	so	he
can review it in a pr	roper f	ashion	l .						

THE COURT: I am going to leave that for the moment to you and Mr. Fee, and Adam Johnson, I guess, or whomever to work that out. Those are the kinds of things that usually counsel, working with counsel for the BOP, can work out. Then if it doesn't work out, you will let me know.

MR. NAFTALIS: I am just flagging it for you. I have talked to the government about it.

THE COURT: Mr. Buryakov, you have been over this protective order with Mr. Naftalis, is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And he signed it, but you agree to its terms and conditions as well?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

It does not need to be signed by the government because it's presented by the government, is that right?

MR. FEE: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: But you would sign it also.

MR. FEE: By its terms, parts of it are binding by the government.

THE COURT: We might add a signature line here today.

MR. FEE: If you would like, I am happy to sign it on

behalf of the government.

THE COURT: So much for that.

So I have two other issues. One is, I meant to ask the last time and I didn't, Mr. Buryakov is charged in part in a conspiracy, right? Is it correct to understand that some members or alleged members of that conspiracy have left the country and are not subject to this criminal proceeding; is that your understanding?

MR. FEE: Your Honor, it would be safe to say in this proceeding that the other two named defendants in this indictment are at large. I do not expect to have any imminent presentments of those two defendants at this time.

THE COURT: Are those ones who enjoy immunity of some sort?

MR. FEE: It gets a bit complicated. When they were in the United States, my understanding is they did enjoy or benefit from a form of diplomatic immunity. Were they to be outside of the United States, again, my understanding is that if they were outside of the United States and did not have any official status here, they would not benefit from it.

THE COURT: Then the other issue is this. We have on the calendar, I believe, a conference scheduled for later this week. Do we need to have that conference or should we adjourn that further for a longer time? It's up to you.

MR. FEE: Your Honor, I will speak only for the

government. I expect you will hear the same from Mr. Naftalis. I would ask the Court to adjourn that for this reason, your Honor. We had hoped to resolve the protective order, we the parties, much sooner, but because it is only just being resolved, they do not yet have the discovery. Again, as soon as it is signed, I am turning it over, but I imagine they will need some additional time to review it.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Naftalis, what is a reasonable amount of time that you would like to have? I am going to ask Mr. Fee to sign and then I will sign. I can do it right here in the courtroom when we finish.

MR. NAFTALIS: We would propose about 45 days to come back, if that's convenient with the Court.

THE COURT: How is May 12 for all of you?

MR. FEE: It's fine for the government.

THE COURT: Let's say at noon if you don't mind.

Mr. Naftalis, am I correct we will call that a status conference?

MR. NAFTALIS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: We will vacate the conference that's scheduled I think for this Thursday in favor of one on May 12, 2015.

Is there an issue of speedy trial or an application in that regard?

MR. FEE: There is an application, your Honor. Before

I get to that application, there is one other discovery issue, which I am sure the Court is expecting to hear about soon, classified discovery.

THE COURT: This order specifically says that it does not cover classified information, so-called CIPA information, is that right?

MR. FEE: Correct, your Honor. We are going to forward to the Court as soon as we can -- I will say we have not yet provided to defense -- a protective order along probably similar lines relating to classified information.

With respect to the first disclosure -- there is classified discovery in this case -- I would ask for two weeks from today to produce that initial round of classified discovery, which I expect will be the large majority of the classified discovery in this case.

THE COURT: When is the protective order likely to be submitted?

MR. FEE: I would hope to get it to you by the end of the week.

THE COURT: End of this week?

MR. FEE: The end of this week. One of the issues that remains, although I expect this will be resolved quite quickly, with respect to Mr. Naftalis, his clearance. I believe he has jumped through all the hurdles, not surprisingly, but there are a few — there's rumors, your

Honor. So once he is cleared, we can hand it over immediately after that.

THE COURT: It would be helpful, if it comes by letter or by fax, that there be a brief explanation that this is the proposed classified protective order that we discussed on March 23, etc., etc.

MR. FEE: We did not do it with the first one, and I apologize for that. We will include a letter outlining what we believe is good cause for the entry of the order and, if we are able to, representing the defendant's position and whether it has been discussed with the client.

THE COURT: That's always helpful.

Did you ask for a waiver of speedy trial?

MR. FEE: I did not, but at this time I would ask that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act in the interest of justice between now and the next conference on May 12, 2015, principally for the defendant to obtain, receive and review discovery in this matter and consider any potential motions they might file.

MR. NAFTALIS: No objection.

THE COURT: I am going to find under 18, United States Code, Section 3161 that the request for adjournment, joined in by both sides, to and including May 12, 2015, at noon, is appropriate and warrants exclusion of the adjourned time from speedy trial calculations. I further find that the exclusion

is designed to prevent any possible miscarriage of justice, to
facilitate these proceedings, including the discovery process,
and to guarantee effective representation of and preparation by
counsel for both parties, that is to say the defense and the
government, and, thus, the need for exclusion and the ends of
justice outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant
in a speedy trial pursuant to 18, United States Code, Section
3161(h)(7)(A) and (B).

So I see that Mr. Fee has already signed and dated this protective order, and the record should reflect that I am doing so at this point in time and dating it March 23, 2015.

Anybody have anything else they want to raise?

MR. FEE: Not from the government.

MR. NAFTALIS: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Nice to see you all.

If you all want to wait around for a copy of this, we will make one for you.

MR. FEE: Thank you very much.

(Adjourned)